Appl. No. 10/763,731

Amdt. dated September 20, 2007

Reply to Office Action of June 25, 2007

REMARKS

The specification has been amended to correct obvious typographical errors.

To expedite prosecution, Claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 10, 11 and 19 have been amended to depend from allowed Claim 22 and/or for consistency with the change in dependency. Claim 21 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of Claim 22.

Accordingly, all claim amendments herein are directed towards matters of form and are unrelated to patentability.

Request for Examiner Interview.

Should the Examiner be of the opinion that this Amendment does not place the application in a condition for allowance, Applicant hereby requests an Examiner Interview prior to the issuance of the next communication from the USPTO to expedite prosecution.

Claims 1-21 are novel over Arnold et al. (6,981,279).

Initially, Applicant notes that Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Arnold et al.

35 U.S.C. 102(b) sets forth:

the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States. (Emphasis added.)

Applicant notes that Arnold et al. is dated December 27, 2005, and the present application has a filing date of January 22, 2004. Accordingly, Arnold et al. was not patented more than one year prior to the filing date of this application and thus a 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection is not proper. To the extend Arnold et al. may be prior art pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), Applicant submits the following remarks.

GUNNISON, McKAY & HODGSON, L.L.P. Garden West Office Plaza 1900 Garden Road, Suite 220 Monterey, CA 93940 (831) 655-0880 Fax (831) 655-0888 Appl. No. 10/763,731

Amdt. dated September 20, 2007

Reply to Office Action of June 25, 2007

Claims 1-20 have been amended to depend from allowed Claim 22. Accordingly, Claims 1-20 are allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 22.

Claim 21 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of Claim 22. Accordingly, Claim 21 is allowable for reasons similar to allowed Claim 22.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion.

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on September 20, 2007.

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Date of Signature

September 20, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Serge J Hodasa

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Reg. Nø. 40,017

Tel.: (831) 655-0880